arXiv:nucl-th/9808006v5 11 Aug 1998

Systematic Power Counting in Cutoff Effective Field Theories for Nucleon-Nucleon Interactions and the Equivalence With PDS

Thomas D. Cohen
Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-4111

James M. Hansen
Montgomery Blair High School, Silver Spring, MD 20901

An analytic expression for the ${}^1S_0$ phase shifts in nucleon-nucleon scattering is derived in the context of the Schrödinger equation in configuration space with a short distance cutoff and with a consistent power counting scheme including pionic effects. The scheme treats the pion mass and the inverse scattering length over the intrinsic short distance scale as small parameters. Working at next-to-leading order in this scheme, we show that the expression obtained is identical to one obtained using the recently introduced PDS approach which is based on dimensional regularization with a novel subtraction scheme. This strongly supports the conjecture that the schemes are equivalent provided one works to the same order in the power counting.

PACS no.: 21.60.-n

Weinberg [1] pointed out that there is a problem with using the standard techniques of chiral perturbation theory (χPT) in nuclear physics (as opposed to hadronic physics). The difficulty is that nuclear physics has low energy scales quite distinct from m_π. In low energy s-wave scattering, the scattering length, a, is extraordinarily long on hadronic scales ($\sim$ 23. fm in the ${}^1S_0$ channel and $\sim$ 6 fm in the ${}^3S_1$ [2] where $m_\rho^{-1} \sim .25$ fms). These unnaturally long scales set the scale at which a purely perturbative treatment breaks down. This suggests that a conventional perturbative approach breaks down at an absurdly low momentum, $k \sim 1/a \approx 10$ MeV in the ${}^1S_0$ channel. Moreover, $1/a$ plays the role of the short distance scale (which we denote as Λ) in the perturbative problem so m_π expansion will not converge.

There has been considerable effort dealing with this "unnatural scattering length" problem during the past several years [1,3–22]. The goal is to implement the general underlying philosophy of effective field theory (EFT) [23] to a problem in which m_π is not the only light scale. Weinberg's proposal [1] was to use χPT to develop a potential (two-particle irreducible graphs) which would be iterated to all orders yielding a Schrödinger equation. In order to implement chiral power counting for the two-particle irreducible graphs, four-nucleon contact interactions are required. However, as noted by a number of authors [5,8,11] when iterated to all orders, there is no straightforward way to implement the nonperturbative renormalization in a fashion consistent with the power counting.

Two main approaches have emerged to get around this problem. The first is via cutoff EFT [3,4,6,8,12,19]. The scheme is to put in *ad hoc* short-ranged form factors in front of the contact interactions. By fitting the coefficients to get certain low energy observables (such as the scattering length) correctly one renormalizes the interactions in a way which is insensitive to the short distance physics. One can test this by demonstrating explicitly the insensitivity of observables to the cutoff scale [17]. The scheme, as implemented to date, has the disadvantage, however, that the calculation of observables has not been formulated directly in terms of an expansion parameter. This obscures one of the main advantages of EFTs, the ability to make *a priori* estimates of accuracy.

The second approach is the so-called pole divergent subtraction (PDS) scheme of Kaplan, Savage and Wise [20]. The scheme is based on an effective Lagrangian containing nucleons and pions and including nucleon contact interactions. In PDS the divergent integrals which arise from these interactions are treated via dimensional regularization with an unusual subtraction scheme: one subtracts poles at $\epsilon = 1$ from the analytically continued integrals rather than only poles at $\epsilon = 0$ as in the usual $\overline{MS}$ scheme. While this prescription seems rather arbitrary, the consequence of this scheme is that coefficients in the Lagrangian have a systematic power counting which is not destroyed by large values of a, and that observables can be systematically expanded. A renormalization group analysis of the coefficients within this scheme shows that the approach requires that the lowest order s-wave interaction needs to be iterated to all orders—building in a nonperturbative treatment suitable for large scattering lengths—while all higher terms and all pionic effects are treated perturbatively. The principal advantage of this scheme is quite clear, one ends up with a treatment which is systematic in Q/Λ where $Q \sim k, m_\pi$ and thus in principle one can make *a priori* estimates of errors due to higher order effects. A number of observables have been calculated with this approach at next-to-leading order including nucleon-nucleon scattering [20], and deuteron electromagnetic form factors [21] and polarizabilities [22].

The purpose of this paper is to show that systematic power counting rules for observables can be implemented straightforwardly in the cutoff approach and to demonstrate the equivalence of the cutoff treatment with the PDS approach (provided both treatments implement the same power counting rules and work to the same order). The explicit demonstration of this equivalence is useful, if for no other reason, since it helps establish the validity of the formalisms. We explicitly demonstrate this equivalence in the context of scattering in the ${}^1S_0$ channel at next-to-leading order including the pionic effects.

We implement a cutoff in configuration space by introducing a separation length scale, R, which essentially serves as a renormalization scale. We parameterize the effects of the physics at lengths shorter than R and calculate the effects for lengths greater than R. The coefficients parameterizing the short distance physics vary with R in such a way as to offset changes in the long distance physics. In this way the formulation is renormalization group invariant. As a practical matter, R must be chosen to be sufficiently large that the effects of the short distance physics are contained almost completely within R. The scale of the long distance physics is m_π and we impose a chiral expansion. Accordingly we must assume formally that $m_\pi R \ll 1$.

We work with a chiral expansion with $m_\pi a$ held fixed, which allows for the unnaturally large value of a. To simplify our power counting, we introduce a single low momentum scale, Q, and define the following power counting rules:

$$m_\pi \sim Q \quad 1/a \sim Q \quad k \sim Q \tag{1}$$

where k is the relative momentum of the colliding nucleons. This analysis based on power counting with a single low scale is consistent with the PDS analysis of ref. [20]. A couple of innocent assumptions go into the derivation of the expression for the phase shifts: i) at large distances the nucleon-nucleon interaction can be described by a Schrödinger equation ; ii) the energy dependence of the logarithmic derivative of the wave function at R is generically set by some short distance scale Λ.

Weinberg's power counting [1] at the level of the two-particle irreducible amplitudes is valid. We use the Fourier transforms of these amplitudes into configuration space. The implementation of the Q expansion is quite simple. One works in the Weinberg expansion up to some fixed order, including only the long distance pion exchange terms which we denote as $V_{\rm long}$. By hypothesis R is taken to be sufficiently large that the effects of the short distance potential are essentially contained within R with an accuracy comparable to or better than the order to which we are working. Thus by assumption, for $r > R$, the entire potential is given by $V_{\rm long}$. The associated Schrödinger equation is subject to boundary conditions at R, which come from fixing the energy dependence of the short distance physics.

For simplicity, we consider the singlet channel and calculate $k\cot(\delta)$ at next-to-leading order—which is $\mathcal{O}(Q^2)$. The long range potential contributing at lowest nontrivial order is simply the central one-pion exchange potential which is given in configuration space by

$$V_{\rm long}(r) \;=\; V_{\rm opep}(r) \;=\; \frac{-g_A^2 m_\pi^2}{16\pi f_\pi^2}\,\frac{e^{-m_\pi r}}{r} \tag{2}$$

Note in this work we are using the convention that $f_\pi \approx 93$ MeV. Thus, the f_π used in this work is $1/\sqrt{2}$ times f_π used in ref. [20]. For $r > R$ the system is described by the following radial Schrödinger equation for the relative position.

$$\left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} \,+\, M\,V_{\rm long}(r) - k^2\right)\,u(r) \;=\; 0 \tag{3}$$

where the s-wave component of the wave function is given by $\psi_s = u/r$, and M is the mass of the nucleon.

It is to useful express $u(r)$ as an expansion $u(r) = u_0(r) + u_1(r) + u_2(r) + ...$ with $u_0(r)$ a solution of the noninteracting Schrödinger equation and

$$\left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} - k^2 \right) u_{i+1}(r) \; = -\, M \, V_{\rm long}(r) \, u_i(r) \tag{4}$$

It is immediately apparent that if the series for u converges, then any set of u_i's which satisfy eq. (4) sums to a u which solves the original Schrödinger equation. The expansion is essentially a Born series except that it is only valid for $r > R$ and has nontrivial boundary conditions at $r = R$. We impose $u_i(R) = 0$ for $i \geq 1$ which puts all short distance physics effects into u_0. Since u_0 is a solution of the free Schrödinger equation it can be written as $u_0(r) = \sin(kr + \delta_0)$; δ_0 simply represents what the singlet phase shift would have been had the long distance potential been removed.

Simple dimensional analysis implies that each term in the expansion for u is order m_π/Λ (Q/Λ) smaller than the previous term; one expects that as $m_\pi \to 0$, the expansion for u to converge. The leading nontrivial effect of the pions is contained in u_1. It is straightforward to compute u_1 using Green's function methods—the appropriate Green's function is $\sin(k(r - r'))/k$ so that

$$u_1(r) \; = \; M \int_R^r dr' \, \frac{\sin(k(r - r'))}{k} V_{\rm long}(r') u_0(r') \tag{5}$$

We use the wave functions asymptotically in the determination of the phase shifts. Inserting $u_0 = \sin(kr + \delta_0)$ into eq. (5) yields

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} u_1(r) \; = \; \sin(kr) \left[\cos(\delta_0) f_1(k) \, + \, \sin(\delta_0) f_2(k) \right] \; - \; \cos(kr) \left[\sin(\delta_0) \, f_1(k) \, + \, \cos(\delta_0) \, f_3(k) \right] \tag{6}$$

where

$$f_1(k) \; = \; \frac{M}{k} \int_R^\infty dr' \, V_{\rm long}(r') \sin(kr') \, \cos(kr') \tag{7}$$

$$f_2(k) \; = \; \frac{M}{k} \int_R^\infty dr' \, V_{\rm long}(r') \cos^2(kr') \tag{8}$$

$$f_3(k) \; = \; \frac{M}{k} \int_R^\infty dr' \, V_{\rm long}(r') \sin^2(kr') \tag{9}$$

Asymptotically the wave function is of the form $A \sin(kr + \delta)$ where A is the overall normalization. From this asymptotic form and the fact that to this order $u = u_0 + u_1$ one can obtain an expression for $k \cot(\delta)$:

$$k \cot(\delta) \; = \; \frac{k \cot(\delta_0) \, (1 \, + \, f_1) \, + \, k \, f_2}{1 \, - \, f_1 \, - \, k \cot(\delta_0) \, (f_3/k)} \tag{10}$$

We need to establish how the phase shift relation above behaves for small Q. First, we note that we can expand $k \cot(\delta_0)$ as a function of k^2. This is an effective range expansion for a system consisting only of the short distance part of the interaction:

$$k \cot(\delta_0) \; = \; -1/a_{\rm short} \, + \, 1/2 \, r_e^0 \, k^2 \, + \, v_2^0 \, k^4 \, + \, v_3^0 \, k^6 \, + \, v_4^0 \, k^8 \, + \ldots \tag{11}$$

By hypothesis, the scale of the coefficients are generically set by the short distance scale Λ: $r_e^0 \sim \Lambda^{-1}$, $v_i^0 \sim \Lambda^{-2i+1}$. This reflects the assumption that at the matching distance, R, the energy dependence of the logarithmic derivative of the wave function is set by Λ. Generically, one would expect $1/a_{\rm short} \sim \Lambda$ but here we will allow for the possibility that $1/a_{\rm short}$ is unnaturally small and will assign it a power counting scale of Q. As we will see subsequently $1/a = 1/a_{\rm short} + \mathcal{O}(Q^2/\Lambda)$. We are working to order Q^2 in $k \cot(\delta)$ so we truncate the expansion at the effective range term. It is useful to rewrite $1/a_{\rm short}$ in terms of its value in the chiral limit plus a chiral correction

$$\frac{1}{a_{\rm short}} \;=\; \frac{1}{a_0} \;+\; d\, m_\pi^2 \tag{12}$$

where we have truncated the chiral expansion at order m_π^2.

Nontrivial chiral behavior is contained in the f functions. Up to an overall multiplicative factor of $(g_A^2 M)/(16\pi f_\pi^2)$ the three f's are functions k with parameters m_π and R and mass dimension zero. One can write such functions as

$$f_i(k; m_\pi, R) \;\sim\; m_\pi \, \frac{-g_A^2 M}{16\pi f_\pi^2} \, \tilde{f}_i(k/m_\pi; m_\pi R) \tag{13}$$

The preceding form is convenient in that we can do Q power counting treating $m_\pi R$ as a small parameter of order Q/Λ. Accordingly we expand in $m_\pi R$; the lowest order contributions come from taking $m_\pi R = 0$. Given a fixed m_π, this amounts to taking R to zero in the integrals. For f_1 and f_3 this can be done quite straightforwardly:

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(k) \;&=\; \frac{M}{k} \int_0^\infty dr' \, V_{\rm long}(r') \sin(kr') \, \cos(kr') \; (1 + \mathcal{O}(m_\pi R)) \\ &=\; - \, m_\pi \frac{g_A^2 \, M}{32 \, \pi f_\pi^2} \left(\frac{m_\pi}{k}\right) \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{k}{m_\pi}\right) \; (1 + \mathcal{O}(m_\pi R)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_3(k) \;&=\; \frac{M}{k} \int_0^\infty dr' \, V_{\rm long}(r') \sin^2(kr') \, (1 + \mathcal{O}(m_\pi R)) \\ &=\; -m_\pi \, \frac{g_A^2 \, M}{64 \, \pi f_\pi^2} \left(\frac{m_\pi}{k}\right) \ln\left(1 + \frac{4k^2}{m_\pi^2}\right) \; (1 + \mathcal{O}(m_\pi R)) \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The corrections due to finite $m_\pi R$ contribute to the final results only at higher order in Q and will be dropped here. In evaluating f_2 one finds a logarithmic divergence when taking R to zero. It is useful to rewrite the $\cos^2$ in f_2 as $1 - \sin^2$ so as to re-express f_2 as

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(k) \;&=\; -f_3(k) \;+\; \frac{M}{k} \int_R^\infty dr' \, V_{\rm long}(r') \\ &=\; -f_3(k) \;+\; m_\pi \, \frac{g_A^2 \, M}{16 \, \pi f_\pi^2} \left(\frac{m_\pi}{k}\right) \; (\gamma + \ln(m_\pi R)) \; (1 + \mathcal{O}(m_\pi R)) \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The logarithmic dependence on R in this expression will ultimately be absorbed in the renormalization process—by renormalization group invariance d has a $\ln(R)$ dependence against which the dependence in f_2 cancels.

We can now insert our expressions for $k\cot(\delta_0)$ and the f_i functions into eq. (10) and expand the resulting expression in Q up to Q^2 to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} k\cot(\delta) = -\frac{1}{a_0} \;&+\; m_\pi^2 \, \frac{g_A^2 M}{16\pi f_\pi^2} \; (d + \gamma + \ln(m_\pi R)) \;+\; \frac{1}{2} \, r_e^0 \, k^2 \;-\; \frac{1}{a_0^2} \, \frac{g_A^2 M}{64\pi f_\pi^2} \; \left(\frac{m_\pi^2}{k^2}\right) \ln\left(1 + \frac{4k^2}{m_\pi^2}\right) \\ &+\; \frac{m_\pi}{a_0} \, \frac{g_A^2 M}{16\pi f_\pi^2} \; \left(\frac{m_\pi}{k}\right) \, \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{2k}{m_\pi}\right) \;+\; m_\pi^2 \, \frac{g_A^2 M}{64\pi f_\pi^2} \, \ln\left(1 + \frac{4k^2}{m_\pi^2}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Note that from eq. (16) and the fact that $kcot(\delta)|_{k=0} \;=\; -1/a$ one finds that

$$-\,\frac{1}{a} \;=\; -\frac{1}{a_0} + \, m_\pi^2 \, \frac{g_A^2 M}{16\pi f_\pi^2} \; (d + \gamma + \ln(m_\pi R)) \;+\; \frac{g_A^2 M}{16\pi f_\pi^2} \; \left(\frac{2m_\pi}{a_0} \;-\; \frac{1}{a_0^2}\right) \;=\; \frac{1}{a_0} + \mathcal{O}(Q^2/\Lambda) \tag{17}$$

We wish to compare our result with that of the PDS scheme of Kaplan, Savage and Wise [20]. We will not review the scheme in detail here since ref. [20] does a good job of explaining clearly the steps necessary to implement the scheme.

We take the relevant expressions from ref. [20] and use the notation of ref. [20] (except we convert to our normalization of f_π). In the PDS scheme, one calculates the scattering amplitudes directly order by order in Q, and infers the phase shifts or $k\cot(\delta)$ through them. By unitarity, the general form of the amplitude is given by

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{4\pi}{M}\frac{1}{(k\cot(\delta) - ip)} \tag{18}$$

In the ${}^1S_0$ channel, apart from pion exchange there are three nucleon contact operators in the Lagrangian which contribute at this order—there is contact interaction with no derivatives, a chiral correction to it and two derivative interaction, parameterized by (scale-dependent) coefficients C_0, D_2 and C_2, respectively. The amplitude at order Q^{-1} is obtained by iterating the C_0 contact term to all orders.

$$\mathcal{A}_{-1} \,=\, \frac{-C_0}{\left[1 + \frac{C_0 M}{4\pi}(ik+\mu)\right]} = -\frac{4\pi}{M}\frac{1}{(1/a_0 + ik)} \tag{19}$$

where the second form can be taken as a definition of a_0. This definition is consistent with the definition used in the cutoff approach; both correspond to the value of the nucleon-nucleon scattering length in an artificial world where the quark masses were strictly zero. It is also useful at this point to observe that the PDS formalism requires that $1/a_0$ is formally treated as being of order Q since $\mathcal{A}_{-1}$ is order $1/Q$. At order Q^0, the scattering amplitude is given as the sum of five terms: $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{A}_0^{(I)} + \mathcal{A}_0^{(II)} + \mathcal{A}_0^{(II)} + \mathcal{A}_0^{(IV)} + \mathcal{A}_0^{(V)}$. They are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_0^{(I)} \;&=\; -C_2\, k^2 \left[\frac{\mathcal{A}_{-1}}{C_0}\right]^2 \\
\mathcal{A}_0^{(II)} \;&=\; \frac{g_A^2}{4f_\pi^2}\left[-1 + \frac{m_\pi^2}{4k^2}\ln\left(1 + \frac{4k^2}{m_\pi^2}\right)\right] \\
\mathcal{A}_0^{(III)} \;&=\; \frac{g_A^2}{2f_\pi^2}\left(\frac{m_\pi M \mathcal{A}_{-1}}{4\pi}\right)\left(-\frac{(\mu+ik)}{m_\pi} + \frac{m_\pi}{2k}\left[\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{2k}{m_\pi}\right) + \frac{i}{2}\ln\left(1+\frac{4k^2}{m_\pi^2}\right)\right]\right) \\
\mathcal{A}_0^{(IV)} \;&=\; \frac{g_A^2}{4f_\pi^2}\left(\frac{m_\pi M \mathcal{A}_{-1}}{4\pi}\right)^2\left(-\left(\frac{\mu+ik}{m_\pi}\right)^2 + \left[i\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{2k}{m_\pi}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\ln\left(\frac{m_\pi^2+4k^2}{\mu^2}\right) + 1\right]\right) \\
\mathcal{A}_0^{(V)} \;&=\; -D_2\, m_\pi^2 \left[\frac{\mathcal{A}_{-1}}{C_0}\right]^2
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where μ is the renormalization scale. Equating 1 over the scattering amplitude from eq. (18) with $1/(\mathcal{A}_{-1} + \mathcal{A}_0)$ and expanding to order Q^2 gives [20]

$$k\cot(\delta) \;=\; ik \,+\, \frac{4\pi}{M\mathcal{A}_{-1}} \,-\, \frac{4\pi\mathcal{A}_0}{M\mathcal{A}_{-1}^2} \tag{21}$$

Inserting the expressions for $\mathcal{A}_{-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_0$ into eq. (21) and simplifying the resulting expression yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
k\cot(\delta) \;=\; &-\frac{1}{a_0} \,+\, \left[\frac{g_A^2 M}{16\pi f_\pi^2}\left(m_\pi^2\ln\left(\frac{m_\pi}{\mu}\right) \,-\, m_\pi^2 \,+\, \frac{1}{a_0^2} \,-\, 2\frac{\mu}{a_0} \,+\mu^2\right) \,+\, \frac{D_2 M}{4\pi}\left(m_\pi^2\mu^2 \,-\, \frac{2m_\pi^2\mu}{a_0} \,+\, \frac{m_\pi^2}{a_0^2}\right)\right] \\
&+\, k^2\left\{\frac{C_2 M}{4\pi}\left(\mu^2 \,-\, \frac{2\mu}{a_0} \,+\, \frac{1}{a_0^2}\right)\right\} \,-\, \frac{1}{a_0^2}\,\frac{g_A^2 M}{64\pi f_\pi^2}\left(\frac{m_\pi^2}{k^2}\right)\ln\left(1 + \frac{4k^2}{m_\pi^2}\right) \\
&+\, \frac{m_\pi}{a_0}\,\frac{g_A^2 M}{16\pi f_\pi^2}\left(\frac{m_\pi}{k}\right)\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{2k}{m_\pi}\right) \,+\, m_\pi^2\,\frac{g_A^2 M}{64\pi f_\pi^2}\ln\left(1 + \frac{4k^2}{m_\pi^2}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where to aid comparison with the eq. (16) we have used eq. (19) to eliminate C_0 in favor of a_0. Comparing eq. (16) with eq. (22) we see the two are identical provided that we identify the quantities in square and curly brackets in eq. (16) with $m_\pi^2\,(g_A^2 M)/(16\pi f_\pi^2)\,(d+\gamma+\ln(m_\pi R))$ and $r_e^0/2$, respectively. The quantities in square and curly brackets in eq. (22) contain coefficients from the Lagrangian which may be adjusted to reproduce the correct short distance physics and hence may be matched to the analogous terms in eq. (22). This completes the demonstration that expressions for ${}^1S_0$ scattering derived using the Schrödinger equation in configuration space is equivalent to the PDS result.

The analysis based on the configuration space Schrödinger equation is along the line of conventional potential model treatments. We simply imposed a power counting scheme in Q on the traditional approach. The PDS approach is superficially very different. Our demonstration of the equivalence confirms the supposition that the PDS approach describes the same physics provided one is in a regime in which the power counting in Q is valid. The extent to which we are in such a regime will be addressed in a subsequent paper.

The authors thank Silas Beane and Daniel Phillips for numerous interesting discussions. TDC gratefully acknowledges the support of the U.S. Department of Energy under grant no. DE-FG02-93ER-40762.

---

[1] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Lett.* B **251**, 288 (1990); *Nucl. Phys.* B **363**, 3 (1991); *Phys. Lett.* B **295**, 114 (1992).

[2] see for example P.E. Hodgson, E. Gadioli and E. G. Erba, "Introduction to Nuclear Physics", (Clarendon, Oxford,1997).

[3] C. Ordonez and U. van Kolck, *Phys. Lett.* B **291**, 459 (1992); C. Ordonez, L. Ray and U. van Kolck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 1982 (1994); *Phys. Rev.* C **53**, 2086 (1996); U. van Kolck, *Phys. Rev.* C **49**, 2932 (1994).

[4] T. S. Park, D. P. Min and M. Rho, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4153 (1995); *Nucl. Phys.* A **596**, 515 (1996).

[5] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage and M. B. Wise, *Nucl. Phys.* B **478**, 629 (1996), `nucl-th/9605002`.

[6] T. Cohen, J. L. Friar, G. A. Miller and U. van Kolck, *Phys. Rev.* C **53**, 2661 (1996).

[7] D. B. Kaplan, *Nucl. Phys.* B **494**, 471 (1997).

[8] T. D. Cohen, *Phys. Rev.* C **55**, 67 (1997). D. R. Phillips and T. D. Cohen, *Phys. Lett.* B **390**, 7 (1997). K. A. Scaldeferri, D. R. Phillips, C. W. Kao and T. D. Cohen, *Phys. Rev.* C **56**, 679 (1997). S. R. Beane, T. D. Cohen and D. R. Phillips, *Nucl. Phys.* A **632**, 445 (1998), nucl-th/9709062.

[9] J. L. Friar, Few Body Syst. **99**, 1 (1996), `nucl-th/9607020`.

[10] M. J. Savage, *Phys. Rev.* C **55**, 2185 (1997), `nucl-th/9611022`.

[11] M. Luke and A. V. Manohar, *Phys. Rev.* D **55**, 4129 (1997), `hep-ph/9610534` .

[12] G. P. Lepage, `nucl-th/9706029`, Lectures given at 9th Jorge Andre Swieca Summer School: Particles and Fields, Sao Paulo, Brazil, 16-28 Feb 1997.

[13] S. K. Adhikari and A. Ghosh, J. Phys. **A30**, 6553 (1997).

[14] K. G. Richardson, M. C. Birse and J. A. McGovern, `hep-ph/9708435`; M. C. Birse, J. A. McGovern, and K. G. Richardson `hep-ph/9807302`.

[15] P. F. Bedaque and U. van Kolck, `nucl-th/9710073`; P. F. Bedaque, H.-W. Hammer and U. van Kolck, `nucl-th/9802057`.

[16] U. van Kolck, Talk given at Workshop on Chiral Dynamics: Theory and Experiment (ChPT 97), Mainz, Germany, 1-5 Sep 1997. `hep-ph/9711222`.

[17] T. S. Park, K. Kubodera, D. P. Min and M. Rho, `hep-ph/9711463`, `nucl-th/9807054`; T. S. Park `hep-ph/9803417`.

[18] J. Gegelia, `nucl-th/9802038`, nucl-th/9805008, `nucl-th/9806028`.

[19] J. V. Steele and R. J. Furnstahl, `nucl-th/9802069`.

[20] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage and M. B. Wise, *Phys. Lett.* B **424**, 390 (1998), `nucl-th/9801034`; `nucl-th/9802075`, *to appear in Nucl. Phys. B.*

[21] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage, and M. B. Wise, `nucl-th/9804032`, *submitted to Phys. Rev. C.*

[22] J-W. Chen, H. W. Griesshammer, M. J. Savage, and R. P. Springer `nucl-th/9806080`.

[23] Reviews of the effective field theory program generally can be found in: A. V. Manohar, `hep-ph/9606222`; and D. B. Kaplan `nucl-th/9506035`.